SINGLE BENCH

(2) 4

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (CG)

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 5833 **/2006**

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA,

PETITIONER

Ashok Kumar Ram (B.Ed.), aged about 48 years, son of Shri Brishbhan Ram, Upper Division Teacher, Government (Tribal) Higher Secondary School Tamta, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 5862/06
Presented by Shri A.N. Bhakta
dated 26-10-06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through – Secretary, Department of Tribal Welfare, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Commissioner, Department of Tribal Welfare, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Assistant Commissioner, Department of Tribal Welfare, District Jashpur Nagar (C.G.)
4. The Principal, Government (Tribal) Higher Secondary School – Tamta, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

RE-TYPED-COPY
26/X/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

COMMISSIONER
ARNA
ALVIYA
2073/96
Chhattisgarh

01. **PARTICULARS ABOUT THE PETITIONER**

17

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (s) No. 5833 of 2006

Petitioner : Ashok Kumar Ram
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. (s) No. 5836 of 2006

Petitioner : Awdhesh Kumar Tiwari
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

W. P. (s) No. 5835 of 2006

Petitioner : Anant Kumar Paikra
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri A. N. Bhakta, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Shri Utkarsh Verma, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents.

ORDER

(30th October, 2006)

1. The petitioners are working as Upper Division Teachers/Assistant Teachers in the government schools. In the course of their services as Upper Division Teachers/Assistant Teachers, the petitioners have obtained B.Ed./B.T.I. examination certificates on their own expenses before 1.3.1999.

2. Writ Petition (s) No.s 5833/2006, 5836/2006 and 5835/2006 are being disposed of by this common order as the facts and question of law involved in these petitions are common.

3. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are entitled to two advance increments in view of the decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another {2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96}. This Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), came to the conclusion that the teachers, who had obtained B. Ed. /B.T.I.

18

Examination Certificate on their own expenses, are covered by the circular dated 24.12.98 (Annexure P/7) issued by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh.

4. Further in the matter of Smt. Manorama Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. and others { 2000 (1) M.P.L.S.R. 136 } the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, Gwalior Bench, while considering the circular dated 1.3.1999 wherein, it is provided that the Assistant Teachers, who have acquired B.Ed. degree at their own cost between 23.10.1964 and 7.5.1973 shall be entitled to two advance increments, relied on decision in the case of Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. & others passed in O.A.No. 1632/99, decided on 12.10.1999 wherein it is observed that the circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively. Thus, a teacher, may be Assistant Teacher, who has obtained B.Ed. degree before 1.3.1999 is entitled to two advance increments.

5. It is pointed out by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the then State of Madhya Pradesh had filed a Special Leave Petition against the orders passed by the Tribunal and the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed Special Leave Petition No. 1999/2000 filed against the order of the Tribunal. Therefore, the direction to the effect that the circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively, passed by the Tribunal, becomes final and the same shall be applicable to all the Assistant Teachers who have obtained B.Ed./B.T.I. examination certificate before 1.3.1999. It is further substantiated by a circular dated 17.10.2003 issued by the present State of Madhya Pradesh wherein the circular clearly states about the decision of the Supreme Court.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the facts and question of law involved in the present case are squarely covered by decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents fairly

concedes and agrees with the averment made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of the order passed in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), subject to verification of the fact as to whether the petitioners have acquired B.Ed./B.T.I. Examination Certificate on their own expenses as per the circulars dated 24.12.1998 and 1.3.1999 and further whether they have been paid two advance increments or not. No order as to costs.

8. A copy of this order be placed on record of connected matters.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

hakur